

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/762,450	NAGAHASHI, TOSHINORI
	Examiner Nancy Bitar	Art Unit 2624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nancy Bitar. (3) _____
 (2) Tiffany Brooks. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 December 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.


(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



ANDREW W. JOHNS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form up to
Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant proposed an amendment to overcome the 112 second rejection. Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment will overcome the 112 rejection. Applicant argued that the limitation of confirming and correcting the keyword which is proposed by the keyword proposing section is not found in Kondo reference. Examiner showed that step s811 to s819 shows how Kondo corrects the keyword and suggested that applicant be more specific in the limitation of confirming the keyword.